

Development Control Policies DPD – Issues to be brought back to Council

Relates to Agenda Item 7 / Appendix F of report to Council meeting of 15 November 2005

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
624	3.7	Delete new paragraph 3.7 on Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) because of concerns that a specific website may not remain in operation for the duration of the plan.	<p>Paragraph 3.7 was added in response to a representation seeking further guidance on the production of HIAs. It is considered helpful to provide guidance to applicants on where to find out information about this new requirement. It is proposed that the Design Guide include guidance on the production of HIAs when it is reviewed before it is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Replace paragraph 3.7 on page 624 of the 15 November agenda with a new paragraph:</p> <p>“Guidance on the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment can be found in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.”</p>
627	3.8	A Member requested the inclusion of some additional wording relating to the integration of car parking into new high density housing developments.	<p>Add new sentence to paragraph 3.8 after second sentence:</p> <p>“Development at higher densities may require more innovative design to incorporate off-street car parking, for example, through integrating garages within the footprint of dwellings or underground parking.”</p>
638	GB/1	Review of Green Belt boundaries at Willingham.	Meeting held with local members and the Parish Council. Willingham Parish Council requests that the proposed Green Belt boundary around Willingham follows the Village Framework between Rampton Road and Over Road with one exception. To the east of Haden Way, the Parish Council proposes that the Green Belt boundary would follow a field boundary south eastwards to the rear of properties on

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			Station Road which would exclude from the proposed Green Belt a relatively small area of land which is surrounded by the village on three sides. See Maps in Agenda Item 10.
638	GB/1	Review of Green Belt boundaries at Over. Whilst this was not a matter specifically deferred to this meeting, the Parish Council raised this issue at the site visit held to look at Important Countryside Frontages at Over.	The Parish Council requests that the Green Belt boundary revert to that proposed on the Pre-Submission Proposals Map and that the changes proposed to Council at its meeting of 15 November not be made. It considers that this could be consistent with the approach at Willingham. See map in Agenda Item 10.
638	GB/1	Review of Green Belt boundary at Church Lane, Sawston to consider whether a triangle of undeveloped land between the ground of Sawston Hall and properties fronting St Mary's Road should be brought into the village framework.	<p>A site visit was held with the local Member and the Parish Council. The site is an undeveloped area with a few mature trees and scrub. The Local Member and Parish Council advise that there are problems with fly tipping and vandalism on the site.</p> <p>The site has a long planning history. In 1980 an application to develop a detached dwelling on the site (S/0385/79/O) was refused by the Council and the subject of an appeal. The Inspector considered that the "case turns on the impact the proposed development would have on the appearance of this part of the village". He commented in respect of the housing estate to the east of the site that had been built a while previously, that "obviously the estate could have been originally planned and laid out with a view to including the appeal site, but in my opinion there was every reason for it to be left as part of the Conservation Area; for it and the old Victorian property opposite now provide an effective and most desirable break between this patch of modern suburban development</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>and the traditional stretch from there along the road towards the church.” He went on to say that “it is surely reasonable to hope that the site might eventually be replanted at some future date, which would greatly consolidate and enhance the Conservation Area – a possibility that would be sacrificed out of hand if another permanent dwelling were to be put up there now.” He also said that “I consider it could open the door to other encroachments on the Conservation Area,” and concluded by dismissing the appeal.</p> <p>There was a further appeal decision against refusal of an application for the erection of a detached dwelling (S/0072/84/O) in 1985. The Inspector advised that his decision “must turn on whether the erection of a dwelling on this site would be detrimental to the character of the village conservation area”. He highlighted that the trees on the site, together with those on adjoining land, are included within a Tree Preservation Order. He commented that “I saw that Church Lane, between the modern housing estate and the church, has retained much of its old rural charm which is emphasised by the large number of trees which successfully screen the housing estate when viewed from around the church and along Church Lane. Although generally undistinguished the trees and shrub cover within the site do provide a significant break between the modern housing and the parkland setting of Sawston Hall and the church. The erection of a dwelling on the site, even with additional planting as you suggest, would inevitably result in a substantial change in its character thereby weakening the effect of this important natural feature within the conservation area. I accept that a dwelling on this site may result in its being somewhat tidier than it is at present but this situation could I feel, be redeemed without the need to develop the site.” He considered that “it is necessary for me to ensure that within a</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>conservation area new development has regard to the preservation or enhancement of its existing traditional elements. In this case I am satisfied that the retention of this site as part of an important local landscape feature is consistent with these aims.” He dismissed the appeal.</p> <p>A further application for a bungalow was refused in 2000 (S/0174/O) as being inappropriate development in the Green Belt, lying outside the village framework and which would result in the loss of countryside and adversely affect the setting of the adjacent Grade I listed Sawston Hall and the appearance and character of the conservation area.</p> <p>Whilst appreciating the problems that this area may be causing in terms of fly tipping and the difficulty in identifying an appropriate long term solution to its future, the views of both Inspectors are fully endorsed as still being relevant to this site and there is not considered to be any planning reason to propose any change to the village framework or Green Belt boundary at this site.</p>
648	HG/2	<p>Members asked for consideration to be given to incorporating a floorspace threshold and / or number of bedrooms in Policy HG/2 in relation to housing mix. Members had also expressed a desire to include a policy for lifetime homes.</p>	<p>Members have previously been informed that emerging government guidance in a consultation relating to a revision of PPG3 is that development plans should not include prescriptive policies on housing mix which include targets based on number of bedrooms. It was recommended that the Pre-Submission Development Control Policies DPD did include such a policy because of evidence that the market is not responding to local needs in the very high proportion of large homes being built over a long period, the findings of the Housing Needs Survey that there is a need for a high proportion of 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings in the district and that the government</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>guidance is currently in draft. A floorspace threshold was not recommended because of the arbitrary nature of any such threshold.</p> <p>In response to Members request that further consideration be given to including floorspace thresholds in the policy either instead of, or in addition to, the number of bedrooms, further research has been carried out. A very recent Inspector's Report into the Basingstoke & Deane Borough Local Plan Review (16 November 2005) made recommendations on a housing mix policy that had included a combination of a specified proportion of dwellings (which varied depending on the accessibility of the location) and a proportion of those smaller dwellings not exceeding a gross floor area of 70 sq.m. The reasons behind the policy are very similar to those being experienced in South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>The Inspector was not persuaded by the approach for various reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The escalation in house prices means it is unrealistic to expect that small market units will necessarily be affordable to entry households and this weakens the justification for the level of detail in the policy. ○ No evidence to indicate that small households that are able to buy on the open market are necessarily seeking small units. ○ Housebuilders need some flexibility in matching the aspirations of small households with the provision of new stock requiring a less prescriptive approach in the policy. ○ The emphasis on higher densities will continue to be an important mechanism in ensuring that developments no longer have a predominance of dwellings with 3 and 4

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>bedrooms.</p> <p>He concludes that sufficient correlation between the housing issues highlighted and the very detailed prescription of the type and size of dwellings. He also concludes that the imposition of a maximum floorspace of 70sq.m. for 80% of 1 and 2 bedroom units is “an arbitrary and unjustified imposition on the detailed design of new housing”.</p> <p>Representations to the Basingstoke Local Plan also addressed the issue of lifetime homes which members of this Council sought to include at earlier Council meeting. Officers advised at that time that the issue of internal house design was addressed through Building Regulations and outside the scope of the planning system, in a similar way to other issues on which GO-East had advised should be deleted from the LDF. Whilst Basingstoke and Deane officers took the same view, it is interesting that the Inspector felt that this was a matter that could be addressed by the planning system because the lifetime homes standards go beyond the requirements of Building Regulations.</p> <p>He considered that ensuring there is a stock of housing designed for, or readily adaptable to the needs of people with mobility difficulties, in his view, is an integral part of meeting housing needs of the area. He felt it would be inappropriate to include a specific arbitrary requirement on all housing developments because the location of sites and nature of housing will be important factors in considering the appropriate proportion. He considered that the policy should encourage the provision of a proportion of lifetime homes built to lifetime standards and the supporting text would explain how it would</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>be implemented.</p> <p>He recommends replacing the policy to read:</p> <p>“New housing development should aim to create mixed and inclusive communities, taking into account the scale of the development, the location of the site and housing needs. There should be a mix of dwellings both in the development overall and within the open market housing provided, including a substantial proportion of 1 and 2 bedroom units. A proportion of new dwellings should be designed to lifetime mobility standards.”</p> <p>He recommended that the supporting text include the housing mix targets based on number of bedrooms that the Council would seek, but he deleted any reference to floorspace thresholds. He also recommended a new paragraph on lifetime homes to read:</p> <p>“Lifetime mobility standards for dwellings have been developed by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation to provide dwellings that cater for the needs of residents throughout their lifetime, including the possibility of impaired mobility. These standards exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations. Overall []% of the population have mobility difficulties; homes designed to lifetime standards would cater for their needs as both residents and visitors. Increasing the number of lifetime homes will increase the opportunities for people to find a home that meets their needs or not to have to move if their circumstances change. The Council will encourage developers to include a proportion of homes designed to this standard with the objective of achieving, overall, []% of all new homes in the Borough to this standard.”</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>On the basis of this very recent Inspector's report which considered very similar circumstances to those in South Cambridgeshire, officers are not able to recommend that the LDF should include floorspace standards within the policy. However, if Members decide they wish to include a floorspace threshold, the 70sq.m. used by Basingstoke and Deane would be a option. This is similar to the size threshold for a 2 bedroom house used previously by the Housing Corporation, although they have recently dropped the use of any standards.</p> <p>The inclusion in policy of standards for specific proportions of properties of different bedroom sizes is questionable in the context of emerging government advise as appears to be already being implemented through Inspector's decisions. The Inspector included such thresholds in the Plan but in the supporting text rather than in policy.</p> <p>The Inspector's recommendation on lifetime homes is surprising in the light of GO-East advice to this Council, but it would provide a context for including reference to lifetime homes within policy if Members wished to do so. The reference to a specific percentage of lifetime homes in the LDF should be based on local evidence of needs. The 2001 Census shows that 13.3% of the population falls into the category of "with limiting long-term illness". The Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies 2.9% of all households as containing a frail elderly person and 4.5% as having a person with a physical disability, giving a total of 7.4%. However, that Census figure includes people without mobility problems whilst the HNS is based on a sample and may not be as comprehensive as the Census. On this basis, a target of 10% would not be unreasonable.</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>Members are invited to make a decision in the light of this information.</p>
659	HG/9	<p>In response to a representation, it was questioned why horses were treated differently to other uses in Policy HG/9, with specific regard to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Guidance in PPS7 is clear that dwellings in the countryside are the inappropriate forms of development in the countryside, unless associated with uses such as agriculture, forestry and rural enterprises. This would also apply in the Green Belt. Therefore it is proposed to amend Policy HG/9 to make it clear that dwellings for the keeping of horses will not be permitted, and dwellings for horse enterprises will be considered if they meet the tests, consistent with other rural enterprises. The keeping of horses does not comprise an agricultural use in legal terms unless it is grazing only with not supplementary feeding.</p> <p>Delete policy paragraph 4 and replace with:</p> <p>“Dwellings associated with the keeping of horses are an inappropriate form of development in the countryside. Where the future need for accommodation is anticipated, stables should be located close to an existing dwelling, or suitable building capable of conversion to such use. Dwellings for horse enterprises will be considered in accordance with the above tests.”</p> <p>Add the following new sentence to follow the first sentence of paragraph 5.39 as on page 661:</p> <p>“It is not considered that the security of horses justifies the provision of a dwelling and there are other methods of providing site security.”</p>

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
			<p>Delete supporting text at paragraph 5.40 as on page 661.</p> <p>Add the following to the end of paragraph 5.41 as on page 661:</p> <p>“...where they comprise a rural enterprise.”</p> <p>Paragraph 5.42 as on page 661 be revised to read:</p> <p>“A Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared for dwellings associated with a rural enterprise.”</p>
685	SF/10	<p>Lord’s Bridge consultation zone – seek financial contributions towards additional expense of consulting on planning applications within the wider zone.</p>	<p>There is a distinction between the applications on which consultation is required between the original consultation zone and the new wider consultation zone which would only require consultation on telecom / microwave transmission applications. This should be clarified in the Plan. The issue of financial contributions will be explored separately.</p> <p>Add a new policy paragraph:</p> <p>“Within the ‘Lords Bridge Consultation Area 2’ (defined on the Proposals Map), development proposals for telecommunications and microwave operations that could adversely affect the operation of the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord’s Bridge will be subject to consultation with the University of Cambridge, and account will be taken of the risk of interference to the equipment being used at the Observatory. Planning permission will be refused where interference would be caused that could not be overcome by conditions or by the use of planning obligations.”</p>
721	CH/7	Review the Important	Site visit held with local members and the Parish Council. It is

Agenda page	Policy / Para	Issue raised at Council	Officer Recommendation
		Countryside Frontages at Over.	proposed to add new ICFs at Over, as shown on the Inset Map where the countryside penetrates to streets or paths which afford the countryside views from public viewpoints which contribute to the character of the village. See map in Agenda Item 10.
	Glossary	Define "rural enterprise".	Definition added to the Glossary: "An enterprise where a countryside location is necessary and acceptable, which contributes to the rural economy, and / or promotes recreation in and the enjoyment of the countryside. Examples may include types of farm diversification, recreation and tourism."
	Inset Map	Technical change to amend the Protected Village Amenity Area boundary at London Road, Sawston.	It is proposed to amend the PVAA boundary to exclude Sawston Medical Centre from the PVAA at London Road, Sawston as shown on the map in Agenda Item 10, which is under construction, as this land no longer performs a village amenity function.